Statement-III

Main observation of Evaluation Studies conducted by Govt. of Gujarat, Kerala and Uttar Pradesh:

I. Evaluation Studies in Gujarat conducted by Sardar Patel Institute of Economics and Social Research Ahmedabad:

1. Substantial employment was generated under the Programme, but no continuous employment to workers could be provided.

2. No systematic efforts are made to assess the extent and nature of unemployment in different regions while planning the works.

3. Wages are not paid in accordance with the Minimum wages.

4. Neither proper linkages are established between different rural development programme for the infrastructural gaps nor needs of different regions identified.

5. All the assets created were not of durable nature.

6. Quality of foodgrains supplied were not always good.

II. Evaluation studies in Kerala conducted by the State Planning Boards

1. Preparation of shelf of projects is not being done in a scientific manner with necessary technical inputs.

2. Expenditure in schemes benefiting Scheduled Castes and Scheduled Tribes was lower than the earmarked 10 percent.

3. The foodgrain distribution was not satisfactory. Quality of foodgrains supplied was low and supply was not timely.

4. Expenditure in non-wage component was low which might have effected the durability of assets.

5. There was greater emphasis on road works, the expenditure on which accounted for 83.21 per cent in 1981-82 and 73 per cent in 1982-83.

6. The programme succeeded to a considerable extent in generating employment . The net addition to employment per worker was 33 days on an average.

7. The execution of works were done through conveners of local beneficiaty committees but contractors often creep in the mark of conveners.

8. In 29 percent of the beneficiary there was improvement in the nutritional levels.

9. There is active participation of Panchayat Committee in selection and execution of work projects.

Hi Evaluation studies in Uttar Pradesh conducted by state Planning Institute,

1. No survey was conducted for earmarking the availability of labourer in different areas and no action was taken for making advance planning for implementing the programme.

2. The selection of works to be taken up under the programme was not based on the priorities laid down in the guidelines prescribed by the Government of India.

3. Among the works taken up roads got the maximum share and in the selected districts the expenditure incurred on road was from 74 per cent to 100 percent.

4. There was no proper coordination between different departments implementing the programme and furnishing of information was unduly delayed.

5. The works done and assets created were not of permanent and durable nature.

6. No arrangements were made for maintenance of assets created.

7. Works were executed in many cases by engaging contractors and middlemen.

8. Wages paid to the workers were delayed in many cases and the minimum wages were paid even if output of work by any worker or group of workers wts more than